

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFREY SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 07-14206  
Hon. Denise Page Hood

DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT and  
CHRISTOPHER GRIFFIN,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING VARIOUS MOTIONS AND SETTING**  
**FINAL PRETRIAL DATE**

Plaintiff Jeffrey Sanders (“Sanders”) filed a series of motions, which fail to advance any legal arguments and could be deemed as incomprehensible. For instance, in Sanders’ motion “Abruptly Warranting Constitutional Judgment and Reliefs” he says “Plaintiff Jeffrey Sanders abridg(es)ing - itinerants’ U.S. Const. Amendments 1, 4, 5-14 itinerary 11 U.S.C..” [**Docket No. 193, filed December 4, 2014**]. And in Sanders’ “Emergency Motion to Settle Proposed Judgment,” he writes, “Jeffrey Sanders, abruptly - axiomatic USDC-E.D Mich. Case No. 07-14206 usurpatory emergency.” [**Docket No. 222, filed June 2, 2015**].

Sanders' motions are filled with indecipherable language. It is unclear to the Court what, if anything, Sanders is trying to convey. Throughout his motions, Sanders randomly cites to different cases and statutes, but fails to explain how these legal authorities are relevant. When faced with incomprehensible pleadings and motions, Courts are free to dismiss them. See, *Kloss v. RBS Citizens, N.A.*, 996 F. Supp. 2d 574, 588 (E.D. Mich. 2014) (quoting *In re King*, No. 05–56485–C, 2006 WL 581256 (Bankr.W.D.Tex. Feb. 21, 2006)) (“[t]he court cannot determine the substance, if any, of the Defendant's legal argument, nor can the court even ascertain the relief that the Defendant is requesting. The Defendant's motion is accordingly denied for being incomprehensible.”).

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motions [**Docket Nos. 191, 193, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, and 225**] are **DENIED**.

The Court received Sanders “Abrupt Pretenatural Pretrial Order” and Defendants’ Submission for Inclusion in Joint Final Pretrial Order. The Court construes both filings as proposed Final Pretrial Orders. Both parties are ordered to appear on the date set by the Court for a final pretrial conference. Parties must

be prepared to draft a joint Proposed Final Pretrial Order at that time. The date for the Final Pretrial Conference is **January 11, 2016 at 3:00 pm.**

S/Denise Page Hood

Denise Page Hood

United States District Judge

Dated: November 19, 2015

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on November 19, 2015, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/LaShawn R. Saulsberry

Case Manager